

together representing an entire day of twenty-four hours. But other observations by myself have given, as the average growth of the hair of the head in persons who had been shaved, $\frac{1}{8}$ of an inch for the week, and consequently $\frac{1}{76}$ of an inch for the twenty-four hours. Now the length of hair comprehended by the white and the brown in the present case is $\frac{1}{36}$ of an inch, and consequently a much more active growth than is normally met with—corresponding, in fact, in a similar ratio, with thirty-seven hours instead of twenty-four.

I therefore refrain from speculating upon the cause of alternation of the healthy and morbid structure presented by this case, and restrict myself to the narration of the fact that during a certain space of time, amounting to a day or more, the hair is produced of normal structure, while during another space of time of undetermined extent the hair is produced unhealthily,—that the periods of healthy formation correspond pretty accurately in extent, as do those of unhealthy formation, while the latter, in measurement, are only half as extensive as the former,—moreover, that the differences of the pathological operation are, the production of a horny plasma in the normal process, and of serous and watery cell-contents in the abnormal process.

I may further observe that it is by no means improbable that the “dead” and faded hair which is met with after some illnesses and in instances of debilitated health may be due to a similar pathological process, although wanting in the periodicity and alternation which render the present case so remarkable.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Theory of the Skull and the Skeleton.

To the Editors of the Annals of Natural History.

GENTLEMEN,—In your December Number Mr. Herbert Spencer wrote claiming to have first enunciated the theory of growth discussed in my epitome-paper on the theory of the skeleton. At this the earliest opportunity possible, I wish to say a word in explanation.

I. I have never read any of Mr. Herbert Spencer's writings, nor do I know any one who has read them. I was therefore quite unaware that my views would find a single supporter beyond the circle of friends with whom they had been discussed.

II. The theory of growth given in the ‘Annals’ for Nov. 1866 was first expounded, so far as I am concerned, in a paper entitled “Researches on the Homologies of the Bivalve Mollusca,” read before the Cambridge Philosophical Society, March 17, 1862. The same doctrine was again urged in a paper on the meaning and value of some structures and modifications of Tetrabrancheate Shells, read Nov. 10, 1862, a portion of which was printed in the ‘Quarterly Journal of Science’ for Oct. 1864. The same view is implied, though not directly stated, in my paper on *Sauropsondylus*, printed in the ‘Annals’ for Sept. 1865; and it is known to certain of my friends that the paper “A theory of the Skeleton” was written

nearly in the form in which it is printed before any part of the 'Principles of Biology' could have been issued. Under these circumstances I did not feel called upon to award to Mr. Herbert Spencer the enunciation of views which I had been urging for years in private, and which I had only not published in full because, being absolutely opposite to the received doctrine that structures produce and determine functions, I did not wish to incur that "faint praise" which I had already found to be the reward of young men who propound new views.

The actual priority is a matter of no scientific importance; and for all that I care, any one who pleases to claim it is welcome to any credit that there may be in it. I do not doubt but the award of that credit will be made by others.

I am Gentlemen,

Very faithfully yours,

HARRY SEELEY.

A new Rodent.

M. Alphonse Milne-Edwards described lately before the Philomathic Society of Paris a very beautiful new rodent lately living in the Jardin d'Acclimatation. It is covered with long soft fur on the body and tail, and black, with white stripes, like a skunk. The teeth are like those of the Hamsters. The skull is most peculiar: the sides of the crown are extended, covering the muscles of the jaw like a hood; and all parts of the skull are studded with regular minute bony processes, only to be compared with the rugosities on the sternum of the *Trionyces*, but differing from them in all the processes being separate and nearly of equal size. M. Alphonse Milne-Edwards has given the name of *Lophiomys Imhausii* to the animal, which was sent from Aden.—*L'Institut*, Feb. 6, 1867.

On Euphysetes simus. By Sir WALTER ELLIOT.

To the Editors of the Annals and Magazine of Natural History.

GENTLEMEN,—On taking up the April Number of the 'Annals' this forenoon in the library of the Linnean Society, I observed a note by Dr. Gray, on Prof. Owen's description of Indian Cetacea from materials furnished by me, in which a statement occurs at page 263, made, no doubt, under an entire misapprehension of the facts, but which may lead to further error unless at once explained.

It is quite true that two representations of the same specimen of *Physeter simus* have been given, the one as a male, the other as a female; but the mistake arose from my having failed to observe, when communicating my notes and drawings to Prof. Owen, that I had inadvertently allowed a cancelled drawing of the *wongu* to remain in the packet. This incorrect sketch has been in my portfolio from the day it was made, fourteen years ago. During that interval it has been lent, with other drawings, at various times, to persons interested in natural history, and has been out of my possession for days, and sometimes for weeks. It is only now, on carefully examining it, that I have discovered a pencil note, made by some per-